

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/022836

Box No. 1

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☒ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/022836

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-5	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-5	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-5	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

This written opinion references the following documents 1-3 cited in the ISR:
Document 1: JP, 2000-287373, A (Shizuki Electric Co., Ltd.), 13 October, 2000 (13.10.00), Full text; all drawings (Family: none)
Document 2: JP, 2004-088869, A (JEOL Ltd.), 18 March, 2004 (18.03.04), Par. Nos. [0032]-[0045], Figs. 5-7 (Family: none)
Document 3: JP, 4-042068, A (Toshiba Corp.), 12 February, 1992 (12.02.92), Full text; all drawings (Family: none)

Claim 1:

The primary reference is document 1 (paragraph numbers [0016]-[0031] and [0046]-[0048], and Figs. 1-5 and 12). Document 1 discloses a power supply device having a capacitor unit, in which when any voltage potential between both terminals of two capacitors (i.e., a difference between the high voltage potentials of adjacent capacitors) exceeds the upper limit voltage, a determination section determines it to be abnormal.

Meanwhile, as disclosed in documents 2 and 3, the constitution in which any voltage potential between both terminals of a capacitor that is lower than the lower limit voltage is determined to be abnormal is well known.

Then, a person skilled in the art could have easily arrived at the constitution of claim 1 by adding the well-known constitution to the power supply device disclosed in document 1.

So, the subject matter of claim 1 does not appear to involve an inventive step.

Claims 2 and 3:

The values of the upper and lower limit voltages based on which the abnormality of a capacitor is determined are a mere matter that a person skilled in the art could have decided as required.

So, the subject matters of claims 2 and 3 do not appear to involve an inventive step.

Claims 4 and 5:

It is a matter of course for a person skilled in the art to perform an abnormality determination process for capacitors belonging to the capacitor unit by starting with a charging voltage value equal to or lower than the value of a predetermined charging voltage with which an abnormality determination can be meaningfully performed (for example, a charging voltage value that renders the voltage applied to each capacitor lower than the upper limit voltage).

Meanwhile, since it is common general technical knowledge that capacitors could vary in capacity, setting down a "predetermined voltage value" by assuming some kind of variability

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/022836

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

distribution is a mere exhibition of an ordinary creative ability of a person skilled in the art.
So, the subject matters of claims 4 and 5 do not appear to involve an inventive step.